HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

The Christian Quarterly

A THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

OL 2. NO. 3

CONTENTS

Editorial
This Also Should Be Our Plea Page 1

Foreward "Looking Ahead"
by Charles R. Gresham Page 2

The Theology of Christian Baptism
by James B. Carr Page 3

The Pastoral Ministry
by T. K. Smith Page 6

Fyodor Dostoevsky, The Man and His Message
by Byron C. Lambert Page 10

Won By Christ -- One In Christ
by James M. Gall Page 17

The Date of Daniel
by Don DeWelt Page 21

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

A Theological Journal representing the viewpoint of those holding the Restoration Ideal and looking forward to the unity of God's people through the proper application of this ideal; the ultimate goal being the Evangelization of the World.

Editorial Council

Enos Dowling — Lester Ford — Dean E. Walker — Burton Thurston — Seth Wilson — James Van Buren

CHARLES GRESHAM, Managing Editor
JAMES M. GALL, Associate Editor

Contributing Staff

Frank J. Albert
Francis Arant
Russell Boatman
Owen L. Crouch
Don De Welt
Robert T. Drake
Howard Hayes
James Earl Ladd II
W. J. Richardson
Lawrence Bixler
Orvel Crowder
Ralph Dornette
Harold Ford
A. N. Hinrichsen
Robert G. Martin
Donald Nash
T. K. Smith
Mildred Welshimer
R. O. Fife
Robert Black
James B. Carr
Joseph Dampier
Harold Hockley
James D. Murch
C. H. Phillips
W. L. Thompson
Byron Lambert

Editorial Policy

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the reverent exposition of New Testament Christianity and the Restoration ideal. The Editors are not to be held responsible for every view that may be expressed.

Address all correspondence to the Managing Editor,

Box 9632, Oklahoma City 18, Oklahoma

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY is published four times annually. Subscriptio price, $3.00 per year in the U.S. and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 2 cents per year additional; other foreign countries, 40 cents per year additional. 3 yea for $8.00 in U.S.; $9.00 elsewhere.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial

The editorial staff had hoped that this number uld include the T. H. Johnson Memorial Lec-es for 1957, but due to some mechanical fficulties it was impossible to get them ready publication. The next issue (Spring number) ll include those lectures by Dr. T. W. Nakarai Butler University.

This issue includes several different essays: . T. K. Smith, outstanding Indiana minister, ntributed an article on "The Pastoral Minis-" as a sequel to the last number of the arterly; Professor DeWelt of Ozark Bible College discusses the date of the book of Daniel; Dr. Byron Lambert of Milligan points up Dostoevsky's significance to our age; Professor James B. Carr discusses the "Theology of Christian Baptism"; and James Gall, whose name now appears on our masthead as Associate Editor, writes about Scriptural Unity.

Below imprinted an editorial from the May, 1956 Bulletin of Central Washington School of The Bible. We believe that the emphasis in this editorial is needed; therefore we wish to give it wider coverage. May this be our pleal

This Also Should Be Our Plea

Much as we delight in the ideals and principles the Restoration movement and realize the mendous step they would make towards heal-the deplorable condition of the Church today sense very deeply the lack of something t is very important and cuts very deeply. rch as we may we find a noticeable absence emphasis on Christian living. Under ordinary ditions perhaps this factor might be over-ked--but this is the very weakness of the vement in the present hour! It is true that W. Stone wrote: "Let every Christian begin work of union in himself, Wait upon God, pray for the promise of the Spirit. Rest till you are filled with the Spirit. Then and till then will you love your God and Saviour--n and not till then you will love the thren . . . . The secret is this, the want of s spirit, the spirit of Jesus, is the grand use of division among Christians: con-quently, this spirit restored will be the and cause of union." It is equally true that exander Campbell himself spoke of coming within the understanding distance. There is a stance which is properly called the speaking stance, or the hearing distance, beyond which e voice reaches not, and the ears hear not. hear another, we must come within the rcle which the voice audibly fills." And then goes on to explain that to understand another must come within that circle which the mind d heart fills. And then we have an excellent otation from Benjamin Franklin when he said: We desire all the faith, all the hope and all e love He (God) imparts to the children of en. We believe in Him, and all He taught; we lieve in doing all He commanded, enjoying l He gives now, and hoping for all He promises, th in this world and the world to come. In e word, we desire to put ourselves under s guidance, to be wholly controlled by Him, be like him, to imbibe His spirit, die in e faith of Him, and live with Him forever." few more advocations of a deeper realization of Christian living are scattered down through the decades, but to say that such was one of the distinctive features of the movement is unallowable in face of its absence in such a massive collection of statements drawn from the movement's outstanding leaders.

We strongly urge therefore that Christian brethren everywhere consider the following neglected truths which have become lost to God's people. In the words of Jeremiah the prophet: "Thus saith Jehovah, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way; and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for yoursouls:" (Jer. 6:16). There are eight old paths that we would like to point out in this article for your consideration.

1. There must be a return to the right divine-human relationship. We must put God again where He properly belongs and man where he belongs. There is too much man-worship, glorification of outstanding individuals today. When more Isaiahs see God high and lifted up with His train filling the temple, there will be more seraphim flying with hot coals from off the altar.
2. We must again emphasize the truth that is fallen into disrepute in the day in which we live, that there can be no Saviourhood without Lordship. We must cease to make Christ a convenience, a way to escape Hell, and must preach Him as Lord and King over all. There is only one way to accomplish this and that is to cease preaching ourselves except as servants to the people for Jesus' sake. Christ must be given absolute dominion and sway over the hearts and lives of the people. We need more bondservants, men and women who have no will of their own, whose wills are swallowed up in the will of another and who serve that other with a total disregard for their own interests. Christ must be all in all or not at all.

3. We must get back again to the belief in the spirit as well as the letter of the Word of God. Jesus placed true religion in the spirit of man and the Spirit of God (Jn.3:24). Only thus can we be delivered from the dead textualism which has captured us in the day in which we live and is fast reducing us to impotence.
4. We must repudiate the evil liaison between the world and the Church. The Church is living in a twilight zone (something which the early apostles knew nothing about, for instance notice the absolute terms in first John). We are slavishly imitating and following and kowtowing to a world that we should repudiate. It is time that we realized that there must be a radical division in spirit as well as in practice between a fallen world and a redeemed Church.
5. We must put the cross back in the heart of man where it belongs. We know all too much about how "Christ died for me" and too little about how "I died with Christ." A life without daily repudiation and crucifixion of the flesh is only half of the gospel. Too many of our people do not know how to "reckon themselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God." We have not taught them how to "arm themselves with the same mind (that Christ had in his death) so that they could cease from sin." The Church has her modern, smooth crosses but does not know the cruel death of the old rugged cross. God help the restoration movement to take the cross from the hill and put it in the heart, so that we may be actually and not just judicially crucified with Christ!
6. We need to return to internalism as opposed to externalism. We must recapture the holy art of worship. In our day we are busy making workers, when God is trying to make worshipers. We've sung ourselves into Tin Pan Alley and we ought to get out of it again and get back to the songs that have some real quality of worship in them. We must learn to minister unto the Lord, not unto individuals nor churches. Our ministry must be unto the Lord.
7. There must be a return to New Testament methods. Some people say, "We believe in the Bible message, but we believe in modern methods." It is entirely possible to be orthodox in our message and liberal in our methods. We must have Bible methods as well as a Bible creed.
8. We must get free from our strange fear of the Holy Spirit. In America the last half-century there has been a frightful reaction from the Holy Spirit because of the fanaticism of certain people who have gone to extremes. My brethren, this ought not to be. The Holy Spirit is our Friend. He cometh down from the heart of Jesus to us, and we should open wide every window of our soul in His incoming.

These are some of the things that we have strayed from. We have done it, inadvertently, slowly and without noticing it, but it has had its terrible effects nonetheless. The true Christian faith has all but passed away and in its place is a circuslike, busy, active, noisy crowd that rushes into the sanctuary and forces the Lord to take a second place. We propose therefore a new plank in the platform of the restoration plea, not in words only but in deed and life.

We plea for a cultivated life of trust, prayer, full of the Spirit and constantly led in triumph for every believer.

LOOKING AHEAD

The members of our third volume are to be designated as commemorative issues, commemorating the hundred and fifty years of the Restoration Movement (1809-1959). Various essays treating history, principles and special topics are being written by leaders of our movement. The plan is to print additional copies and bind these under one cover as a commemorative volume, which we shall try to have available at the 1959 North American Christian Convention.

But, even though the next five issues are designated, we continue to invite manuscripts of merit, treating pertinent and relevant Biblical, historical or theological issues.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

JAMES B. CARR is Professor of Christian Doctrine at Manhattan Bible College, Manhattan, Kansas. He is the author of A HISTORY OF THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH and has contributed to several religious journals.

DON DeWELT is Professor of Bible and related subjects at Ozark Bible College, Joplin, Missouri. Professor DeWelt has written several books, among which ACTS MADE ACTUAL and SO YOU WANT TO PREACH have been widely used.

JAMES GALL is Associate Editor of THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY and an advanced student at Midwest Christian College. We are very happy to introduce Mr. Gall as one of the outstanding younger men in our Movement.

BYRON LAMBERT is Professor of English Literature at Milligan College, Tennessee. He had previously been a successful minister in Chicago, Illinois. Dr. Lambert will appear again in our pages since he delivered the 1958 T. H. Johnson Memorial Lectures at Manhattan Bible College.

The Theology of Christian Baptism

by James B. Carr

THE THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

Historically, the rite of baptism had its origin prior to and outside of Christianity. Judaism was familiar with ceremonial washings. Moses "washed" Aaron and his sons before they exercised their priestly ministry (Lev. 8:6. This seems to have been the reason for and use of the laver just outside the tabernacle). Baptism practiced among the Jews, i.e., ceremonial washings are classed with the transient forms of Levitical worship (Heb. 9:9-10) which had not been intended to endure except "until a time of reformation." It would be erroneous to say that those ancient washings developed into the Christian ordinance. A shadow cannot develop into a substance. [1]

Some time after the Babylonian captivity and the restoration of worship by the returning remnant, the bud of messianic expectancy blossomed into full flower. One aspect of this was the apparent reversal of attitude on the part of the Jews towards converting Gentiles. Previously they had been coldly indifferent to missionary activity; now they were zealous enough to encompass "land and sea to make one proselyte." During this period baptism of proselytes as an initiation ceremony was added to circumcision, the identifying mark of the Jew. [2]

Proselyte baptism seems to have been a custom in Judaism in the days of Christ. Yet, that it is not to be considered the origin of Christian baptism, should be evident from the fact that the Jews were startled when John the Baptist baptized. (Jn. 1:25)

Some scholars believe that the Jews were expecting some such sort of purification rite in the days of the Messiah to supersede (or fulfil) the Levitical practice. A few Old Testament references are sometimes cited in support of this belief (Isaiah 4:4, Zech. 13:1, et al). A delegation of Pharisees inquired into the Messianic character of John, his preaching and his baptizing (Jn. 1:19-28). This shows (1) that they were already familiar with baptismal practice; (2) that they associated it with the Messiah's mission; and (3) that they were eager to identify the messiah so as to join forces with Him. It should be noted that John's baptism was not for purifying priests, nor for initiating proselytes. It seems to have had the effect of gathering together a special fellowship of Jews who were anticipating the Messiah's coming momentarily, and were making proper moral and spiritual preparation for the glorious event. (Luke 3:3-20) [3]

Several pagan cults had initiatory ceremonies similar to Christian baptism, though with such obvious differences that it is hardly likely that Christianity borrowed the practice from some competitive cult (cf. Mithraism and the taurobolium).

A group of men may play dice on their knees, making serious incantations with each toss, but no one would mistake this similarity to prayer with the actual practice of Christian worship!

The Christian practice was related to the baptism of John the Baptist and its action and meaning must be viewed in the light of that fact.

John's baptism was immersion in water in testimony to one's repentance and in order to secure the forgiveness of sins through identification with the anticipated Messiah. (Mark 1:4, Acts 19:4; Jn. 1:30-31; Luke 3:7-8). That it was of Divine authority rather than of human invention is apparent from Jesus' conversation with the chief priests and elders (Matt. 20:23-32). It was because of its relation to penitence and forgiveness and its expectancy of a coming Messiah, that John himself had difficulty in seeing why Jesus should be baptized. He stated that he needed such a ministry from Jesus, not Jesus from him (Matt. 3:13-17). But Jesus would not allow John to practice open membership even for the Son of God! He, too, had to obey God's commands--fulfil all righteousness--no matter how pious He appeared to be! (Even sinlessness, purity, perfection are not legitimate reasons, in His sight, for dispensing with the Divinely authorized rite).

It has been suggested that only by entering into that community which was to be introductory to the Messianic kingdom (i.e., by attaching Himself to John the Baptist, like any other man), was it possible for Him to reveal Himself to John the Baptist and through him to others. [4] John who had heralded the Messiah's coming (prophetically) needed this assurance to announce His presence (in fulfillment).

For all others whom John had baptized (before or after Christ) the act was a preparatory consecration to the Kingdom of the Messiah. For Jesus it was a consecration also by means of which He manifests the beginning of His Messianic career.

Though Jesus did not personally baptize, He did cause many to be baptized by His disciples. This led to envy by John's disciples until the Baptist let it be known that this was as it should be (Jn. 3:25-4:2). One thing is clear from this interchange of thought. Baptism in each case was a mark of identification with re-

gard to a community. Those baptized by John or his disciples belonged to John's community of messianic hopefuls. Those baptized by Jesus' disciples identified themselves as followers of the One John identified as Messiah.

These were the ideas associated with the action of baptism prior to Christian baptism:

(1) Ceremonial purification or cleansing from sin, guilt.
(2) Initiation into community and identification of individual with that community.
(3) Identification with messianic mission.
(4) Repentance and forgiveness.
(5) Attainment of righteousness (right status in God's sight).

In connection with the last named, it cannot be stressed too strongly that obedience to the Divine will was associated with the action--whether that action was a priestly lustration, proselyte baptism or John's baptism. In the case of John's baptism, those who obeyed justified God while those who refused rejected Divine authority (Luke 7:29-30).

With regard to (2) and (3), it will be observed that the Great Commission to "disciplize" the world stresses "baptizing them" as the means by which this is to be accomplished along with teaching of full obedience. In a sense this commission can be said to be the point of origin for what is distinctly Christian baptism. What Jesus had said to Nicodemus earlier concerning the new birth of water and spirit would only have been interpreted in reference to baptism, but might not be thought of in reference to a (then) future ordinance but rather to the contemporary practice--John's baptism. In which case Jesus is asking Nicodemus to identify himself with the kingdom of God by this visible means utilized by John and his associates. While this is a possible interpretation of John 3:1-5, it is also possible that it DOES refer to Christian baptism, the form of church practice conditioning the report of the account. In any case the origin of Christian baptism is not to be found here, but rather in the command of the Risen Lord commissioning his followers to make Him known universally.

While this is the origin of the rite, (on the Divine side)--the command of Christ, the real beginning of Christian baptism is recorded in Acts 2:41 "So those who received his word were baptized, and there were added that day about three thousand souls." The apostles had received authority when the Holy Spirit came upon them. (Acts 1:8, 2:4) Peter had used that authority to convince the multitudes that the One whom they had crucified was their only Saviour and Lord. Conscience stricken, they had asked "What can we do?" Peter, with the authority of the Holy Spirit, repeated Jesus' commands of repentance and baptism. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38) Those who received (i.e. accepted as authoritative) his word obeyed it ("were baptized," v. 41) and the Christian fellowship known as the Church dates its origin from that point. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers."

It is significant that all of the ideas associated with the action of baptism prior to this were also associated with this event and its action. Along with repentance this ceremony contained a promise of forgiveness of sin. Baptism in the name of Jesus to that multitude might connote many things but two things certainly would be apparent to all: (1) this was the means of identifying themselves with the Messiah (2) what they were doing was by the Messiah's authority. In doing this they were attaining the right status with God.

There is, however, one distinctively new concept associated with baptism here at the beginning of the Christian practice: the reception of the Holy Spirit. At the baptism of Jesus by John, the Holy Spirit came upon Him, but this was a separate event. In some instances of New Testament conversion there was an event of Holy Spirit reception separate from baptism (Samaritans, Acts 8:14-17; Cornelius, Acts 10:44-48; twelve men at Ephesus, Acts 19:1-6). In each of these cases some special manifestation of the Holy Spirit's presence and power are realized. There is nothing in these instances to preclude the reception of the Holy Spirit at (and by means of) Christian baptism according to the promise of Acts 2:38 (cf. Acts 5:32). Without doubt, this receiving of the Holy Spirit by the individual was the intention of Jesus teaching to Nicodemus concerning the new birth (Jn. 3:1-5).

In all of the cases of Christian baptism reported after Pentecost, these same meanings obtained, both this unique addition of the receiving of the Spirit, and the prior notions associated with the action. To sum up briefly all of these cases, it might be said that, by this action, penitent believers in Messiah identified themselves with Him and with His Kingdom, in order to receive forgiveness of sin, and thus purged, might enter a new status before God.

In two other respects Christian baptism displays a unique meaning--in the New Testament Church. Each of these had been anticipated in earlier connotations of baptismal action but both required the fulfilling of the Messianic mission in order to be clearly perceived: filling

One of these is the concept of New Testament Christians that baptism brought one into

nion with Christ. Certainly, all that has been id above to show that baptismal action, a eans of identification with the Messianic ission, indicates the background for this idea. ne destinctive Christian feature here is in e recognition that the messianic mission has en completed and this is the specific means which one is qualified to share its beneficent sult. Those who are baptized are "in Christ," in the Lord;" they have "put on Christ," ey have been "baptized into one body" (II Cor. 2:13) which doubtless refers to the "church, hich is His body." (Eph. 1:22)

There is no known case in the New Testaent (or in the ancient church for that matter) here an unbaptized person was designated by ny of these terms ("in Christ" etc.). The sage of primitive Christianity shows that to e "in Christ" is to have been baptized and to e baptized is to be one with Christ (and one ith those who are also in Christ).

The most vivid New Testament statement on is matter is Romans 6:3ff.: "Do you not know at all of us who have been baptized into hrist Jesus were baptized into His death? e were buried therefore with Him by baptism to His death, so that as Christ was raised om the dead by the glory of the Father, we o might walk in newness of life. For if we ave been united with Him in a death like is, we shall certainly be united with Him in resurrection like His. We know that our old elf was crucified with Him..."

Paul regarded baptism as more than symboli- al; it was the act which secured the result: nion with Christ, through His death and resurection. [5] "It was not merely an acted descripion of that result" which might have been aused some other way. The action of baptism as considered by the apostle as the essential eans to that end. [6]

This text also points out the other uniquely hristian meaning baptism received in the New estament Church. It was uniformly acnowledged that salvation, i.e. forgiveness and edemption, was accomplished by Christ through His death on the cross. If the New Testament s not clear with regard to the theology of how he death of Christ saves, it is nonetheless efinite as to its necessity for salvation. The simplest statement is given in I John 1:7: "the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from ll sin." In Romans 6:4, Colossians 2:12, and ther passages, we are told how the saving value f Christ's blood is appropriated by baptism y the penitent sinner who needs and desires salvation.

This meaning throws light on many statements of Scripture which might otherwise seem obscure or indefinite:

I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. Galatians 2:20.

Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me and I to the world. Galatians 6:14.

(see also: I Peter 1:17-25; 2:22-25; 3:14-4:2; II Timothy 2:11; Hebrews 10:22; et al.).

The preaching of the apostles centered in the redemptive work of the Messiah at the Cross. This was His final act of obedience in the completion of His saving ministry. "Even though He was a Son, He learned obedience through what He suffered." (Hebrews 5:8). Baptism is the first act of obedience of a penitent believer in the Messiahship of Jesus. By it he is united to Christ's death thereby securing the benefit of His obedience (cf. Romans 5:19). Faith is the action of the intellect, repentance of the will, but baptism is a physical action in obedience to a specific command. He who obeys this command shows that he is willing with the whole life obediently to serve Christ. This single initial act of obedience is valid only when it stands for the commitment of life itself. It is like the marriage ceremony, the oath of allegience by a naturalized citizen, and other similar initiatory rites which involve total life commitments.

A clear understanding of the Biblical meaning of Christian baptism should settle with finality some of the issues raised in connection with the practice.

That the act is necessary for salvation should be clear from the fact that this was the action by which one came into union with Christ and appropriated the saving value of His death. If there is any other means by which this might be done, the New Testament does not say and we are not at liberty to put words into the apostolic testimony which are not there.

It should be noted that any universal command of Christ is essential inasmuch as obedience is an admission of His Lordship, i.e., His right to command and expect obedience. Any disobedience amounts to denial with the life, regardless of the profession of the lips. The importance of baptism as an essential is not only in active obedience but in the spiritual significance Christ (and the Holy Spirit directed apostles) attached to the action. What is essential to salvation is (1) acknowledgment of Christ's Deity and Savioushood, (2) a new birth, a death to the old pre-Christian life and a resurrection to a new life--a new creature, (3) cleansing from sin, or pardon, purification, justification and sanctification, and (4) union with Christ. Baptism in the New Testament was inseparable from these essentials. It was the means by which one's confession was first demonstrated; the point from which forgiveness is first ex-

perienced (Acts 22:16), and the point from which personal union with Christ may be dated.

It would never have occurred to any one in that day to doubt the necessity for baptism. That this is so is evident from the proximity of baptism in time to penitent faith. As soon as persons recognized the Lordship and Saviourhood of Jesus and desired to follow Him, they were baptized at once with no interval between penitent faith and baptism. Saul of Tarsus waited longer than any other recorded convert (three days) and the first word of the preacher sent to him was, "why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, washing away thy sins."

The meaning of Christian baptism gives it validity and value. The meaning is pictorially experienced in the act of immersion (and not in any substitute mode). At the present time, as in the history of Christianity, there is no valid argument against immersion as the Biblical form of the action. Those who accept other forms should consider carefullv the loss of meaning in so doing. And in the interest of Christian Unity and spiritual growth, contemporary Christians should accept the New Testament practice as sufficient. Christian unity begins with baptism since everyone who comes into union with Christ is thereby united to all others who have been united with Him. (see I Corinthians 12:13).

Open membership (receiving the pious unimmersed into Christian fellowship without baptism) was invented as an easy device for achieving Christian unity. It has become in fact a hindrance to unity. That this is true is attested by the divisions in Christian Churches at both congregational and communion wide levels. That it is true at the ecumenical level also may be assumed from the attitude of other immersionist communions which will not practice open membership for unity or any other purpose (e.g. Eastern Orthodox, Southern Baptists, etc.)

It is interesting to note that this problem occurred among professing Christians, not among prospective converts. Whoever is ready to accept Christ as Lord and to follow Him, is ready immediately to obey baptism without raising any issues with regard to its necessity or its mode. Perhaps the solution of all baptismal problems will be nearer at hand when all Christians can become as humbly submissive. Whatever else the new birth might signify, at least humility and obedience are primary conditions of it. And Christian baptism, before all else, is a command to be obeyed rather than an issue to be debated.

by James B. Carr
Manhattan Bible College
Manhattan, Kansas
June 15, 1957.

1. I. S. B. E., Vol. I, p. 396
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Lucke, Commentary on John 1:30 ff.
5. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. II, p. 382
6. Ibid.

The Pastoral Ministry

by T. K. Smith

THE PASTORAL MINISTRY
T. K. Smith

The pastoral ministry is the foundation of success in the Christian ministry. This is not to imply that there are not other requisites. In fact, in this present age, three things are required of a minister if he is to succeed.

The minister must be able to preach well enough to interest and to challenge and inspire the people of his community. Regardless of his personal popularity and of the strength of the organization of his church and of the sense of loyalty which has been developed in the congregation, the crowds will not come to hear him unless he is able to hold his audiences by the power of his preaching. The minister, therefore, must spend much time in developing himself in this field. In budgeting his time, which is essential in every well-planned ministry, he dare not let the call even of other important things compete unfairly with the time required for thorough development of his sermons.

Yet preaching alone will not assure success. Competition, not only from other community churches, but also from a multitude of forces striving for the interest and time of folk, requires in an age of organization the marshalling of the people of the local church for effective service. Indeed, the church has come to realize the absolute necessity of local organization. The successful minister of the modern church must be well qualified as an administrator. Fortunate is the young minister who attends or has attended a Bible College well equipped for instruction in church administration. Even more fortunate is he who has natural ability in this field. However, by patience and perseverance, the knowledge and technique

essential church organization can be acquired.

The third requisite is the pastoral ministry. is difficult to over-emphasize the importance this phase of the ministry. There is hardly y part of the minister's work that is not fected by this. The minister must become e pastor or the good shepherd of his flock. e has to know their needs, their problems, eir aspirations. He has to share in their sor- ws and their joys, their defeats and their ctories. He must weep with them and join their laughter. He must be so close to them at the people of the church turn naturally to m for strength in their weakness, for help their distress, for comfort in their grief, r counselling in the solution of their prob- ms.

In order to meet all of the pastoral re- irements, the pastor must live close to s Lord. If the congregation is to turn readily d naturally to him, he must radiate confidence d good cheer. His faith in God, in life; in s people must be evident. Fortunate is the inister when his people turn to him readily nen they need the strength of his faith and e satisfaction of his life as a Christian.

No man can for long assume this strength d faith. No man, relying on himself alone, can eet the multitude of personal needs. Without constant and close walk with the Lord, he will il. The pastor cannot afford to neglect his evotional associations with his Master. If rist is to be presented to the people, the stor must have Christ within him. The pastor, erefore, must have constant communion with e Lord if the reality of God is to be trans- itted to those under his pastoral care.

Of course, when the pastor really cares for s people until their burdens become his, there great need of a constant fellowship with the ather for no man can carry such a load with- ut divine assistance.

For a minister to be a really good pastor, e must love people. Sometimes one must work this phase of association. One's attitude can e trained until concern blossoms into the uitfulness of a genuine service of devoted inistration.

Let us consider some of the work of the inister as he seeks to serve as a pastor.

First, there is calling. Here is where many ministry breaks down. Because at times it an become somewhat of a chore, the minister as to discipline himself by designating certain ays and periods for the various kinds of calls be made and then must proceed to keep his hedule as nearly as his uncertain daily pro- ams will permit.

When a minister goes to a new field and his harge is not too large, he should try as soon s possible to visit his entire membership. n this way, he gets acquainted personally with his people and begins new friendships. He also learns to know something of the needs of the people and thus is better equipped to know how and what to preach. Of course, the true Gospel preacher will preach the Gospel of Christ as the power of God unto salvation. This is essential and usually expected. The great doctrinal themes properly preached often rejuvenate the church. But there are those who must be trained in Christian living. There are many also who come to the services of the church with special needs. The minister has to be with his people and visit in their homes before he can be prepared properly to bring in his messages that which is needed.

I heard the story the other day of a minister of a large metropolitan church. He was engaged for the purpose primarily of preaching. He was a specialist in this field. Others were employed by the church to care for pastoral calling. After several months of unsatisfying experiences in his preaching, he realized that he was not meeting the needs of his people and he was unhappy and frustrated. Then he decided that the only way to correct this situation was to know the people. Realizing that the best way to accomplish this was by calling in the homes, he planned his work so that over a span of several months he made thirteen hundred calls. According to his statement, this changed his ministry. He brought sermons that "talked their language" and met their needs. The shepherd then led his sheep into green pastures. The minister who lives among his books instead of sharing his time by living among his people usually restricts tremendously his usefulness and often becomes a failure.

There are other than general congregational calls that are essential for proper shepherding. When people are really ill they want and need their pastor. This duty cannot be delegated to an assistant. In a larger church the calls in the home where there is minor illness must be limited by necessity in the pastor's calling program. The assistant will be expected to do most of these. When, however, the illness becomes serious, the assistant must turn this over to the pastor. The pastor dare not disregard this. I know of a large church of Christ that employed a very capable minister--one of our best. For years he efficiently and faithfully performed his duties. He was well liked and very successful. The church grew steadily under his administration until he was invited to many places to tell of his achievements. The growing work became too heavy for him and it became necessary for him to have an assistant to care for the mounting pastoral duties.

Knowing the problems that are so prone to rise in the employment of an assistant, he carefully and prayerfully sought for two or three years to get just the right man. As in all other

phases of his administration, he was successful in securing just the right man. The assistant was and is a splendid Christian gentleman--just the type of a Christian leader whose personality would not clash with any thoughtful fellow minister.

In dividing the pastoral duties, the pastor decided to take the hospital calls and to have his assistant be responsible for making the calls in the homes where there was illness. Even in dire illness the assistant called and the pastor did not usually share with him in this. This was the beginning of an unhappy situation for the pastor. Since the assistant had been with the family all during the illness of their loved one, he was called at the time of death and asked to preach the funeral service. The people slowly but surely began transferring their appreciation and affection to the assistant. At first they expected their pastor whom they loved, and were hurt when he did not come as a pastoral friend in the dark hour preceding death. While some time elapsed before it became necessary to leave, the pastor came to realize he had lost his hold on his people and took another field. No minister can afford to turn any area of his "sick" calling completely over to another.

Calling on the sick is an art in itself. One can accomplish much in this field or he can greatly restrict himself. The sick are always glad to see their pastor; especially is this true of those who are hospitalized. Here they are away from home and often lonely and apprehensive. They need encouragement and assurance.

Old Brother Mark Collis of Broadway in Lexington, Kentucky, was one of our most famous pastors. He was considered among the best. He had a way about him that not only endeared him to his people but in the hour of serious illness, especially where there was an operation impending, they must have Brother Collis. So successful was he in his hospital calling that when he became too old to do much else, one of the hospitals in Lexington gave him quarters in the hospital and he spent much of his time visiting the patients blessing them with his unusual ability to bring comfort and good cheer to the ill. He was able to lead his people into the presence of the Lord and to have confidence in His power to heal and His willingness to do so. One of his oft quoted statements was to patients making preparation for an operation, "Have faith in your Lord; have faith in your good doctors; have faith in yourself and you will get along all right."

The minister in visiting the sick must be able by his own attitude to create confidence. His words must express a strong faith in the healing power of the Great Physician and always the minister should pray for the patient. His prayer should be optimistic, thanking God for His blessings being bestowed upon the patient. It should breathe the spirit of hopefulness and give an assurance of the Lord's continued presence, concern and loving watch-care. One way in which the pastor creates confidence is for him to have an air of perfect trust in the Lord. Let him approach the sick room with the spirit of good cheer and radiant faith. He should never have a look of anxiety or uncertainty. The patient so often studies the expression on the faces of those who visit him and the long, dolorous face will usually make the visit harmful instead of beneficial.

In visiting the ill, especially in hospitals, the pastor should not stay very long. If the approach is proper, much can be accomplished within a very few minutes. No set rule can be established concerning this, but the minister's good common sense can tell him when to leave. Usually five minutes are sufficient for the ordinary routine hospital call. If the pastor has to drive some distance to an out-of-town hospital, he would be expected to stay a little longer, but not much. Of course, the condition of the patient should determine largely the length of the visit.

There is no time when the minister is more greatly needed than when death has occurred. The family needs comfort, assurance of the eternal victory of faith over death, and strength and courage to face all that is involved in the loss of one greatly beloved. The minister, therefore, must not delay in going to the home. Because of the bereaved family's confidence in and affection for the pastor, they await his coming with an eager need. His presence usually seems to quiet their grief and they listen intently and hopefully to what he has to say. Because they mean so much at a time like this, the minister will want to choose his words carefully, without dwelling upon the phase of the degree of loss sustained and the expected grief, it would probably be wise not to minimize the hurt to the bereaved. But then the good pastor has the opportunity of leading these needy folk into the presence of Him who conquered death and promised, "Because I live, ye shall live also." The minister needs to speak with great certainty of God's plan for the full blessings of life eternal and show that death is necessary for man to fulfil his destiny.

The promises of Jesus to be with his bereaved, shocked and lonely children should be clearly presented. Even though the Christian believes in life after death according to the promises of God and the concept of this victory of faith that overcomes death, he still needs the peace that comes through the personal blessings of the comforting presence of the Master.

The good shepherd will not lose this opportunity of leading his bereaved members closer to Christ and to His church. These

ople are more receptive to the call of the urch than at any other time. And there is no rer way of finding peace than through a con- crated service to His life and to His cause.

Absenteeism is one of the big problems of e church. Evangelism is a recognized, sential part of the program of the church. w would question the necessity of planning d working for the constant winning of souls Christ. In fact, in many churches this cupies a major part in the life of the con- egation. This is as it should be, but then a agedy is enacted. The members are not refully shepherded. Even the new members many churches are neglected and not properly ented. It has become common knowledge that e "back door of the church is as wide s the front door." Many churches with a fairly od program of evangelism grow very little nce the net gain is negligible. Caring for the embers is just as important as winning them. ere again the pastoral ministry is essential. he minister of course will not rely solely his ministration in this field. The organiza- on of the church should function so that from thin it there should be careful attention given this problem. Cards, telephone calls and ersonal visitation by classes and other church ganizations should play an important part in tting the absentee know that he is missed and anted. No congregation can grow very large ithout such a carefully planned and operated rogram.

The minister's work in this field is vital. e should quickly teach the new members their esponsibilities to Christ and to the church and en personally supervise their orientation. As e visits these new members and they become cquainted with him, they usually learn to appre- iate and even to love their pastor. As the inister teaches them the position of the church; s they come to believe completely in the ovement to restore New Testament hristianity, and as they have confidence in the reacher, the battle against absenteeism will be enerally successful when further reasonable ttention is given when needed.

Pastoral counselling is becoming one of the ore important phases of the Christian ministry. here has always been a tendency for the inister's membership to want to bring their roubles and problems to him. Within the last w years, however, this has become a major art of the ministration of the church. More and ore of the church membership come to the astor and many people associated with no hurch avail themselves of this service.

This new field of pastoral service requires some preparation if the counselling is to be really helpful. Bible Colleges and Seminaries are offering some aid in their curricula at the present time. These courses will become more complete shortly because the demand is so great. The older ministers are availing themselves of short summer courses in this field. Almost every minister would be benefited by attending lectures, seminars and convention addresses on this theme.

While it would do the average pastor much good to read a few carefully chosen books on psychiatry in his efforts to help those who are nervously distraught or neurotic, he must ever remember that he is not a psychiatrist and should not try to be one. It takes keen discernment and sound judgment for the minister to know when he can no longer help a person and that this person should be directed to a good psychiatrist.

This emphasis on preparation and wisdom is given because of the multitude of problems that will come before the pastor for solution. Almost every category of trouble will be presented to the average minister who serves a church of any size for any great length of time. A priest once said that every known sin had been confessed to him except covetousness. This is perhaps the experience of most protestant ministers. Blessed is the minister who through preparation and good common sense and sound judgment is equipped to serve in this ever growing field of pastoral service.

The great churches of our brotherhood, almost without exception, have been the result of long ministries and in almost every instance these men were noted primarily for their pastoral ministry. To be a great church leader, it is almost essential for a minister to be a great pastor.

P. H. Welshimer was the pastor of the largest Christian Church in the world. He spent practically his entire ministry in building the Canton, Ohio Church from a mere handful of people to a membership of over seven thousand. His preaching filled his great church Sunday after Sunday and his administrative ability was amazing. But according to his own statement, his pastoral ministry came first. Because of his success, he was invited all over the nation to speak. His acceptance was usually contingent upon his not being needed at home. Many a scheduled appearance to speak was cancelled by a telegram stating that a death had occurred in his membership and he could not leave his people in their need.

It requires such fidelity to pastoral duties based upon devotion to his people for a man to be a success in the Christian ministry.

Fyodor Dostoevsky - The Man and His Message

by Byron C. Lambert

INTRODUCTION: HIS LIFE

He will judge and will forgive all, the good and the evil, the wise and the meek... He will say, 'Come forth ye drunkards, come forth, ye weak ones, come forth, ye children of shame!' And we shall all come forth, without shame and shall stand before Him...And He will hold out His hands to us and we shall fall down before Him... [1]

So cries Marmeladov, the proud, pathetic drunkard of CRIME AND PUNISHMENT. So also speaks Dostoevsky, the apostle of compassion, who spent a lifetime probing the hearts and minds of sinners, with the hope of reconciling man to God.

Fyodor Dostoevsky was reared an Orthodox Christian in St. Petersburg, Russia. He received the baptism of the Russian Church eight days after his birth in 1821 and lived to be one of its greatest protagonists, so that he was given extensive ecclesiastical honors upon his death in 1881.

Dostoevsky was no story-book saint, however. Early in his career he had hob-nobbed with leading political radicals and had fallen under the suspicion of the government. Accordingly he was tried and condemned to death, but at the last minute sent to Siberia for imprisonment. It was during the four severe prison years that Dostoevsky rethought his whole philosophy of life. With the help of the New Testament, his only book in prison, he saw that life, in order to be sane, had to be centered in an absolute moral system; this moral system, he discovered, depended entirely upon God's revelation in Christ.

He came out of prison to poverty. He developed epilepsy, and along with it melancholia, irresponsibility in money matters, bigger and bigger debts, deeper mental and moral suffering, until at last, throwing sense and faith to the winds, he lost himself in a neurosis of gambling. He traveled in Europe to get away from creditors and to try his luck at the tables. He had a love affair. He lost everything, even his underclothing.

But he had been writing feverishly all this time. He stored up all of his thoughts and impressions, faith and doubts, problems and sympathies, and poured them out in his books. He was at last given editorial work in St. Petersburg. Here he joined with those who were known as Slavophils in the laudation of the Russian Czar and the Russian soil. He married. He finally tore himself away abruptly from gambling. With his wife's help he was saved from destitution.

With a real appreciation for the poor and outcast, Dostoevsky peopled his books with all sorts of sainted sots, pure prostitutes, and heroic sinners. No writer has ever portrayed the humble and forgotten so sympathetically. He had known criminals intimately. He had been brother himself to vice and lostness of soul. He saw, with the range of a prophet's vision, that life is not to be redeemed by mere socialism or the rearrangement of political systems. Sin lay deep, and men loved it, and loved themselves as they were more than anything: this he saw. Only Christ, he declared, could save such a world. With Christ's compassion and man's repentance, life could be redeemed, even at its bitterest and lowest ebb.

His books are an apologetic for this conviction. CRIME AND PUNISHMENT is a portrayal of the degradation and salvation of a man who, void of faith, commits murder without conscience. The IDIOT is the story of a perfect Christian who comes into conflict with his environment, with the result that all who reject him are destroyed. A RAW YOUTH depicts a young man who is fighting his way out of scepticism; THE INSULTED AND INJURED is a melodramatic presentation of the theme of suffering and redemption; THE POSSESSED is a revelation of the satanic superficiality of revolutionary systems and an attack on positivism; THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV is an attempt to draw out comprehensively a graphic picture of the misery sin brings and the serenity which belief in Christ produces. Dostoevsky's lesser works reinforce this theme. His ability to dissect the workings of the human mind has made him world renowned; conversation in his books is drawn out as no other writer can depict it; utter passion, extreme intellection, ingenious suspense are the literary mirabilia of Dostoevsky.

Dostoevsky's books seem, as one handles them, to flow mysteriously together into one book, and this book is the book of the Last Judgment. The great obscure land he leads us over, so full of desolate marshes, and forlorn spaces, and hemlock-roots, and drowned tree trunks, and Golgothas of broken shards and unutterable refuse, is the land of those visions which are our inmost selves, and for which we are answerable and none else. [2]

II. HIS THEOLOGY

Dostoevsky occupied himself mainly with three fields of theology; they are, anthropology, soteriology, and apologetics. In more concrete terms, Dostoevsky was interested in everything about the make-up of a man; he wanted to know how to save him; and in the process, he made it his duty to fight off the wolf of scientific positivism.

A. ANTHROPOLOGY

Dostoevsky's anthropology is built upon the idea that man is free. He is free morally; he is free existentially. This is because he is created in the image of God. This freedom is therefore ultimate; man does with it what he wants. The "Man Underground" says,

> One's own free unfettered choice, one's own caprice - however wild it may be, one's own fancy worked up at times to frenzy - is that very "most advantageous advantage" which we have overlooked, which comes under no classification and against which all systems and theories are continually being shattered to atoms...What man wants is simply independent choice, whatever that independence may cost and wherever it may lead. [3]

In the memoirs of his prison experiences Dostoevsky gives concrete proof of this unpredictable freedom of man.

> In our convict establishment there were men whom I was familiar with for several years, and whom I looked upon as wild beasts and abhorred as such; well, all of a sudden, when I least expected it, these men would exhibit such an abundance of feeling of the best kind, so keen a comprehension of the suffering of others, seen in the light of the consciousness of their own, that one might almost fancy scales had fallen from their eyes. So sudden was it as to cause stupefaction; one would scarcely believe one's eyes or ears. Sometimes it was just the other way: educated men, well brought up, would occasionally display a savage, cynical brutality which nearly turned one's stomach.... [4]

Therefore,

> The whole work of man really seems to consist in nothing but proving to himself every minute that he is a man and not a piano key. [5]

Because a man is so radically free, he is therefore ultimately responsible. The hero of THE POSSESSED, the sceptic Stavrogin, goes to the monk, Tihon, for advice. Tihon says,

> If you can put the question: am I or am I not responsible for my acts? Then you are unquestionably responsible. [6]

Old Fyodor Karamazov, the dissolute father of the Karamazov brothers, is evil because he loves it. No one has made him greedy or lecherous; he has made himself that way, and revels in it to the last bitter dregs. Raskolnikov in CRIME AND PUNISHMENT murders simply and coldly, just to prove to himself that he is superior to every moral restraint. He gloats over his success in commiting the perfect crime. To deny that you are answerable for what you do, says the "underground man" is to destroy your reason:

> It was not only that I could not become spiteful, I did not know how to become anything: neither spiteful or kind, neither a rascal nor an honest man, neither a hero nor an insect. Now, I am living out my life in my corner, taunting myself with the spiteful and useless consolation that an intelligent man cannot become anything seriously, and it is only the fool that becomes anything. [7]

Whatever a man sows, that shall he also reap. The doctrine of environmentalism is shattered on the facts of life and history. Heredity cannot be blamed. Original sin is not transmissible; it is individual. Hence, in Dostoevsky, infants are "sinless like the angels" [8], but adults - "they've eaten the apple and know good and evil." [9]

Man, in order to cleanse himself, must repent. He must admit his responsibility. In fact, Dostoevsky believes a man must declare that he shares in the universal guilt so completely, that he should admit not only his own sins but his encouragement of sin in others. Each person is in a transcendental, existential sense responsible for everyone else. Says Zossima, the saintly monk in THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV, "We are all responsible to all for all." [10]

> As soon as you sincerely make yourself responsible for everything and for all men, you will see at once that it is really so, and that you are to blame for everyone and for all things. [11]

This irreducible freedom and responsibility of the human spirit makes the fact of individual personality the most supreme fact of the universe. God is an individual personality; Christ is an individual personality; Satan is a

personality; man is a personality. Personality is the plumb and the peak of historical, psychological, or supernatural reality. It is the ultimus of existence. Dostoevsky wrote a friend,

> Reflect on the "I" which can grasp all this. If the "I" can grasp the idea of the universe and its laws, then that "I" stands above all other things, stands aside from all other things, judges them, fathoms them. In that case, the "I" is not only liberated from the earthly axioms, the earthly laws, but has its own law, which transcends the earthly.[12]

It was because he took this hypothesis that Dostoevsky spent so much time with people rather than with things in his novels. He is interested in delineating what his characters think, not what they wear. Whole chapters in his works are given over to the study of one person's thoughts, motives, or recollections. Like Shakespeare, Dostoevsky created each character with affection and care. No matter how unimportant he was to the plot, or how poor he was in mental or moral equipment, each character had an individuality in his own right. It is primarily because of this that Dostoevsky's novels are so discursive, voluminous, and hard to follow. There seem to be no "prop" characters in his stories. One can very easily lose his way trying to discover who the central hero of a novel is. Even mere tramps and servants are given to theologising on the Book of Revelation. Dostoevsky saw saints and giants among his fellow-convicts where most of us would only see mere inferiors.[13] Not even a convict can forget he is a man.[14]

It is from this doctrine of personality that Dostoevsky draws his proof for immortality[15], and upon which he rests his case for Christianity.

B. SOTERIOLOGY

There is one soteriological pattern running through all of Dostoevsky's works: it is, suffering, love, resurrection, in that order. It may be expressed in the formula

suffering - love - resurrection

The terms are Dostoevsky's own; the formulistic analysis is mine.

Raskolnokov must suffer before he can come to a realization of the enormity of his crime. As he is, he is a conscienceless murderer, setting himself up against God. Through love he comes to spiritual clarity. It is the pure and self-sacrificing prostitute, Sonia, who with love and concern reads the New Testament to him and awakens in him new perceptions and attitudes. Through love for her, he takes her advice and confesses the crime. This makes him suffer. It breaks his will-to-power; it sets up heaving psychic readjustments; it humbles him; it sends him to prison; it tosses him on the goads of God's law. But in prison he is regenerated; the old man disappears, the new man takes its place. Without love Raskolnokov could never have suffered; and without suffering, he could never have had a moral resurrection.

Stepan Verhovensky, the garrulous old "liberal" of the Possessed finds salvation the same way. Stepan is a foppish intellectual and a thorough-going utilitarian socialist of the old school. He practices his "ideas" on all his charges, including his own son, and rears a group of uprooted, purposeless, cynical revolutionaries. These proteges destroy society, cause deaths, disrupt lives, and at last murder for the sake of progress and "new ideas." At the end Stepan's world is shattered around him; he wanders from home and meets a peasant woman selling New Testaments. He buys one, reads it, and begins selling them himself. He has found the love of God. On his deathbed he confesses after a wasted life,

> My friends, God is necessary to me, if only because He is the only being whom one can love eternally.[16]

Through the realization of Divine love, Stepan Verhovensky comes to his senses. Only through suffering and love can he say, "Oh, I should dearly like to live again."[17]

Dmitri Karamazov, the eldest of the Karamazov brothers, must travel the same via dolorosa. Mitya, as he is called, is a passionate, inconsistent man of the world - constantly in debt, in a brawl, or an ecstacy. He and his worthless father are infatuated with the same woman. Mitya also hated his father for abandoning him as a child and stealing his inheritance. In a drunken rage, Mitya goes to kill his father. He arrives only to find someone else has beaten him to the satisfaction. Mitya is suspected and condemned. The evidence is all against him at the trial, - even Mitya's conscience, because he would have killed his father had he been given the chance. In prison Mitya and his conscience brood over eternal matters. Through the love and confidence of his younger brother Alyosha, he contacts new depths of being. Like Raskolnokov, Dmitri finds new life by a self-imposed imprisonment.

The woman in the case, Grushenka, passes through the same trial. She learns what suffering is, and through the respect of Alyosha, who gives her new confidence in her womanhood, she gets a new moral grip on herself.

Father Zossima, in the same book, is the modal monk who has passed through a period of suffering in order to reach his peace and

serenity.

The only unsaveable people in Dostoevsky's books are those who refuse to take their suffering. Stavrogin was advised by Father Tihon to impose some suffering on himself in order to recreate his soul. Stavrogin refuses and ends up a suicide. Svidrigailov, in CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, is a voluptuary and cynic who despises all self-sacrifice, but who at last shoots himself. Versilov, in A RAW YOUTH, fails to achieve any real greatness because he does not know either suffering or love. In order to have spiritual renewal these sinners must suffer the torture of humbling their pride, their ego. This they refuse to do. Dostoevsky's warning is, "Humble yourself, proud man, and first of all break down your pride."[18] Dostoevsky says it is because of this sin that intellectuals mistake the truth where peasants never do. "Our peasant may sin, but he will always say sooner or later: 'I did falsely.'"[19] The peasant is willing to take his suffering; he can achieve purity. He will repent. In a large part it is the pride of the uprooted intellectual which inhibits his spiritual growth.

It is not suffering alone which brings redemption, for suffering without love leads to brutality; nor is it love alone which can save a man, for love without suffering is mere sentimentality; it is the union of the two which produces the novus homo.

Christ's suffering and crucifixion, His love, and His physical resurrection provided Dostoevsky with a symbol of his doctrine. Indeed Christ's example becomes in Dostoevsky a sacramental pattern. Christ did not die so much FOR the world, as He set the example of suffering, loving, and dying. It was a fellow-convict who suggested to Dostoevsky, "You are sorely tried. Suffer with patience. Christ also suffered."[20] Only through one's own suffering can his sin be expiated and new life begun. The sinner completes in his body, in a very real way, what remains of Christ's afflictions (Col. 1:24). Christ arose after His suffering; so the sinner arises after his degradation. In fact, Dostoevsky even uses the word resurrection freely and universally to mean normal and spiritual renewal.

In Dostoevsky's thinking, the Russian people had a peculiar mission to the world. Russia could suffer as no other nation could. She was a "God-bearing people," as Shatov says.[21] With the Russian Christ she could renew Europe. "Russia lives not for herself, but for an idea." Versilov says, "For almost the last hundred years Russia has lived. . . . only for the other states of Europe."[23] If she has suffered in the process of living for the other nations, it was but her mission to do so. Perhaps through her suffering and love she can redeem Europe.

Suffering, love, resurrection, these three are the corners of Dostoevsky's doctrine of conversion.

C. APOLOGETICS

Because positivism and socialism reduced man's importance metaphysically, Dostoevsky took much time and effort attacking them. He insisted that man was not a mere product of his environment and heredity; he was more than an insect. The "underground man" says science erects a stone wall of laws proving you are descended from a monkey and that the basis of all morality goes back to selfishness.[24] He declares:

> I cannot break through the wall by battering my head against it if I really have not the strength to knock it down, but I am not going to be reconciled to it simply because it is a stone wall and I have not the strength.[25]

Rakitin tries to convince Mitya Karamazov Rakitin tries to convince Mitya Karamazov that he murdered his father because of environmental factors. Mitya's soul, he explains, is only "little tails" of nerves quivering in the brain which set up a reaction causing an image. Mitya is told to make way for "chemistry and the new man.'[26] Socialism, Dostoevsky insisted, simply wanted to reduce the world to a placid ant-heap on the basis of scientific laws. Razumihin, in CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, cries:

> Everything with them is "the influence of environment; and nothing else. Their favorite phrase! From which it follows that, if society is normally organized, all crime will cease at once, since there will be nothing to protest against and all men will become ingenious in one instant. Human nature is not taken into account, it is excluded, it's not supposed to exist.[27]

Lebedeff, in THE IDIOT says that the Star called Wormwood in the Apocalypse is the railways of Europe; not railways, properly speaking, but the general tendency of which railways may be considered as the outward symbol and expression.

> We hurry and push and hustle, for the good of humanity. . . . As for me, I don't believe in these waggons bringing bread to humanity. For, founded on no moral principal, these waggons may well, even in the act of carrying bread to humanity, coldly exclude a considerable portion of humanity from enjoying it.

Ruskin was saying the same thing in England about this same time.

Dostoevsky deplored this reduction of man to a dollar's worth of chemicals. He satirizes it bitterly in many of his shorter works; particularly, THE FRIEND OF THE FAMILY, "The Crocodile," and "An Unpleasant Predicament." He attempted to show the pernicious effects of this doctrine in the lives of a good share of his major characters. Raskolnikov murders because morality is a social expedient; Stavrogin looks at his watch while a small child he has outraged hangs herself in the next room - he has no conscience except his own desires; Kirillov, the atheist in THE POSSESSED, writes a paper on the necessity of suicide and then kills himself in the name of progress; Smerdykov, the bastard son of Fyodor Karamazov, kills his father because he admires the ideas of his half-brother Ivan; Ivan loses his sanity because he refuses an absolute morality; Prince Alyosha, in THE INSULTED AND INJURED destroys himself because he can believe in nothing; Hippolyte, the cynical, nihilistic consumptive, in THE IDIOT, says that he knew that he was not going to live, and that it was all the same whether he killed himself or not - it would be a last free act in a sombre universe; and the prosecutor, Ippolit Kirillovitch, in his speech says there is a growing cynicism among modern youth - they commit suicide without even the nobility of Hamlet's question on their lips.

So you DO built a socialistic utopia a thousand years from now; the Raw Youth argues:

> Why should I be bound to love my neighbor, or your future humanity which I will never see, which will never know anything about me, and which will in its turn disappear and leave no trace... when the earth in its turn will be changed into an iceberg, and will fly off into the void with an infinite multitude of their similar icebergs; it's the most senseless thing one could possibly imagine. That's your teaching. Tell me why I am bound to be so noble, especially if it all lasts only for a moment? [29]

Dostoevsky blames all this on rationalism and straightway attack reason. Dostoevsky's tragic heroes are all thinkers, reasoners, who have not discovered ultimate answers. It is by reason they have concluded men are animated vegetables; it is by reason they give up the supernatural; it is upon reason they will build an ordered world; it is by scientifically reasoned principles they come to atheism and suicide. The tramp, Dolgoruky, in A RAW YOUTH, says, "Some have been through all the sciences, and are still depressed.'[30] Down with Reason, says Dostoevsky, there is something higher.

Intuitive feeling is what will at last save us. In a letter to his brother, Dostoevsky wrote:

> Nature, the soul, love, and God, one recognises through the heart, and not through the reason . . . Reason is a material capacity, while the soul or spirit lives on the thoughts which are whispered by the heart . . . . Reason is a tool, a machine, which is driven by the spiritual fire. [31]

By enlightenment he says,

> I understand . . . . that which is literally expressed in the very word: ENLIGHTENMENT - a spiritual light which shines upon the soul and illumines the heart, which directs the mind and reveals to it the way of life. [32]

Morality comes, not from science, but from faith and religious feelings: "Moral ideas spring from religious feeling. Logic can never justify them."[33] In his parable of paradisial innocence, "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man," the sinless beings (Adam and Eve)

> desired nothing, but were calm; they did not aspire to a knowledge, because their life was fulfilled. But their knowledge was deeper and higher than our science, for our science seeks to explain what is life, she aspires to know life, that she may teach others how to live; but they, without science, knew how to live. [34]

Dostoevsky once said,

> There is nothing more beautiful, more profound, more lovable, more reasonable, more courageous and more perfect than Christ, yes, and I tell myself with jealous love, that there could be nothing. More than that, if anyone proved to me that Christ was not in the truth, and it really was a fact that the truth was not in Christ, I would rather be with Christ than with the truth. [35]

All this socialistic and rationalistic utopianism, however, Dostoevsky blames on one evil source: Roman Catholicism. The Western Church, by depending on temporal power and force to unite mankind, betrayed Christ. The Roman Church, with its papacy and political philosophy of unity taught socialism all it knows. Prince Myshkin says, "Roman Catholicism is....simply the same thing as unChristianity." [36]

Roman Catholicism, in my opinion, is worse than Atheism itself. . . Atheism only preaches a negation, but Romanism goes further; it preaches a disfigured, distorted Christ - it preaches Anti-Christ...The Roman Catholic religion is not a faith at all, but simply a continuation of the Roman Empire...The Pope has seized territories and an earthly throne and has held them with the sword. And so the thing has gone on, only that to the sword they have added lying, intrigue, deceit, fanaticism, superstition, swindling; - they have played fast and loose with the most sacred and sincere feelings of men - they have exchanged everything - everything for money, for base earthly POWER! And is this not the teaching of Anti-Christ? Atheism is the child of Roman Catholicism...It grew and fattened on hatred of its parents: it is the progeny of their lies and spiritual feebleness. [37]

Dostoevsky's most profound attack on Romanism is found in THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV, in the parable of The Grand Inquisitor. In this parable, Christ comes back to earth during the Inquisition and is arrested for disturbing the peace. The Grand Inquisitor accuses Him of giving man something he cannot bear, - freedom to choose between good and evil. Freedom, the Inquisitor says, makes men unhappy: they do not want to make a choice and be responsible. They want to live by bread alone. So the Church takes over all responsibility for them, allowing them to sin and forget it, and protecting them from conscience, doubts, and questions. The Inquisitor believes man is intrinsically worthless and must be protected from the secret at all costs. The Inquisitor tells Christ he has corrected His work.[38] Like the Socialists, the Romanists want to build a "contented ant-hill."

Dostoevsky hated all forms of authoritarianism. Tyranny, he says, is a disease.

Blood and power intoxicate; they aid the development of callousness and debauchery; the mind then becomes capable of the most abnormal cruelty in the form of pleasure; the man and the citizen disappear forever in the tyrant; and then a return to human dignity, repentance, moral resurrection, becomes almost impossible. [39]

The planned world of Shigalev, in THE POSSESSED, and the pragmatic religion of the Grand Inquisitor, even though founded on a certain pity for mankind, are to be repudiated, since they degrade the worth of the human individual.

World brotherhood, Dostoevsky affirmed, was to be founded not on law but on love and by the uncoerced discipleship of everyone to Christ. The destiny of Russia was to spread this gospel of love.

To be a true Russian does indeed mean to aspire finally to reconcile the contradictions of Europe, to show the end of European yearning, in our Russian soul, omnihuman and all-uniting, to include within our soul by brotherly love all our brethren, and at last, it may be, to pronounce the final Word of the great general harmony, of the final brotherly communion of all nations in accordance with the law of the gospel of Christ. [40]

Also,

Do I speak of economic glory, of the glory of the sword or science? I speak only of the brotherhood of man; I say that to this universal, omni-human union the heart of Russia, perhaps more than all other nations, is chiefly predestined; I see its traces in our history, our men of genius, in the artistic genius of Pushkin. Let our country be poor, but this poor land "Christ traversed with blessing, in the garb of a serf! Why then should we not contain His final word? Was not He Himself born in a manger? [41]

It was Russia's duty because she had the true Church. In this process the State was to become the Church. Not the Church the State, but the State the Church! The world would be saved by a Christian citizenry; not a civil Christianity.

This catholic view of the Church is one of the truly original contributions of Dostoevsky to the modern theological world. He should certainly be heard from in discussions at the World Council of Churches, especially where Russian Orthodox representatives are seated.

III. CRITIQUE

Dostoevsky's emphasis on the freedom of man is pertinent and timely. Biological or theological determinism is to be eschewed. But is freedom necessarily whim? Is it essentially irrational? It may be observed that it was through reason and thinking and logic that Dostoevsky reached his conclusions. Dostoevsky's atheists are rational atheists, true; but his Christians are rational Christians as well. They have thought themselves through doubt to faith. Every one of Dostoevsky's saints went through a philosophical conversion. It is because believing in Christ makes sense of the world, and

because a world without Christ does not make sense, that they become Christians. Now is this not being rational? Versilov, a philosophic deist, says, he "could not get on" without Christ.[42] Dostoevsky asserts again and again that a world order without Christ is doomed to failure, because if there were only two men left on the earth, one would kill the other to have the advantage. He writes, "nothing is more beautiful, more lovely, more REASONABLE" than Christ.[43] He wrote an enquiring mother, "You will never find anything better than the Saviour anywhere, believe me."[44] The atheist Kirillov says of Christ,

> That man was the loftiest of all on earth. He was that which gave meaning to life. The whole planet, with everything on it, is mere madness without that Man.[45]

Because nature crucified Him, Kirillov continues, "all the planet is a lie and rests on a lie and on mockery.'[46] Remember Kirillov was the Socialist who killed himself. Dostoevsky here manifestly proves it is unreasonable and suicidal to reject Christ. Dostoevsky himself reasoned his way to Christ on a common-sense basis. Why then, this repudiation of reason? It is inconsistent to prove the invalidity of reason by reason.

The thing which was "higher than reason," which Dostoevsky agonized to define, was revelation, if he had allowed himself to come to it in so many words. He ostensibly based "enlightenment" upon religious intuition. But, in every case the religious intuition somehow becomes the Christian religion. It becomes by some happy circumstance not Hinduism, nor Shintoism, but Christianity. He says, "Christianity of our people is and must FOREVER REMAIN the chiefest and most vital basis of its enlightenment.[47] No matter how many of his monks, mystics, and peasants subjectively "intuit," the same rather objective Christ appears in their midst. The Church even considered Dostoevsky its chief champion of historic, outward, sacramental Orthodoxy. Dostoevsky is really saying reason must be supplanted with revelation. Alexander Campbell said as much in his debate with Owen; and who would call Campbell an irrationalist? Ivan Karamazov, an atheist, wonders how it is possible that the idea of God should enter the minds of savage, vicious mankind.[48] That is just Campbell's point. It happens to be Dostoevsky's as well, whether he recognizes it as such or not.

It is also to be wondered how far one should follow Dostoevsky's suggestion for self-tortune in order to rid oneself of sin. This sounds like ancient Eastern asceticism. Are we responsible to all for all? Must we voluntarily, like Christ, suffer, take the blame for all, atone for all? Is it necessary to do any more than what Christ has already done for us? Is it not at least presumptious, if not blasphemous, to say Christ's death did not go far enough? Perhaps Dostoevsky's sentiments went beyond his intentions. He was a writer, not a systematic theologian. His was an individualistic scheme of salvation which failed to see the Church. Of course, we must remember, he accepted without question the Orthodox sacramental system; he was therefore at a real theological loss to give any ecclesiastical definition of "conversion," which was palpably taking place among people who were already, by infant baptism, supposed to have been converted.

His limiting of the salvation of the world to a Russian mission is absurd. Were he only alive today!

His fear that atheistic scientism should sweep Russia has come true; his fear that atheistic socialism should destroy lives in the interest of "progress" has come true; his attack on the mystery and magic of Romanism is still timely; his exaltation of a universal, united, yet simple Church of Christ should appeal to catholic minds everywhere. Out of his manias and vices and passion, Dostoevsky was able to rise to an ennobling faith in Christ. EX FORTI DULCEDO. "Out of the strong came forth sweetness."

FOOTNOTES

1. Fyodor Dostoevsky, Crime and Punishment, trans. Constance Garnett ("The Living Library; Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Co. 1947) p. 32
2. John Cowper Powys, Visions and Revisions (New York: G. Arnold Shaw, 1915), p. 258
3. Fyodor Dostoevsky, The Short Novels of Dostoevsky, Intro. by Thomas Mann (a Permaneut Library Book; New York: The Dial Press, 1945), p. 145-6
4. Fyodor Dostoevsky, The House of the Dead, Intro. by Julius Bramont ("Everyman's Library", no. 533; Fourth Print; London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1916), p. 307
5. Short novels of Dostoevsky, p. 149
6. Fyodor Dostoevsky, The Possessed, trans. Constance Garnett (New York: The Modern Library, Inc., 1936), p. 722
7. Short novels of Dostoevsky, p. 130-1.
8. The Brothers Karamazov, trans. Constance Garnett (New York: The Modern Library, Inc., n.d.), p. 383.
9. Ibid., p. 282
10. Ibid., p. 362
11. Ibid., p. 384

12. Fyodor Dostoevsky, Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to His Family and Friends, trans. Ethel Colburn Mayne (New York: the Macmillan Co., n.d.), p. 234
13. The House of the Dead, p. 367
14. Ibid., p. 180
15. Letters to His Family and Friends, p. 234-5
16. The Possessed, p. 673
17. Ibid., p. 674
18. Fyodor Dostoevsky, Pages from the Journal of an Author, trans S. Koteliansky and J. Middleton Murry (Boston: John W. Luce and Co., 1916), p. 51-2
19. Ibid.
20. Geoffrey Drage, "Russian Literature (1800-1900), The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. XI, The Growth of Nationalities, ch. xxii, "Russia and the Levant after the Crimean War" (cheap ed.; London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1934), p. 651.
21. The Posessed, p. 250
22. Fyodor Dostoevsky, A Raw Youth, trans. Constance Garnett (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1928), p. 465
23. Ibid.
24. Short Novels of Dostoevsky, p. 136
25. Ibid
26. The Brothers Karamazov, p. 716-7
27. Op. Cit., p. 239
28. Fyodor Dostoevsky, The Idiot, Intro. by Ernest Rhys ("Everyman's Library", no. 682, Second Print; London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1916), p. 363.
29. A Raw Youth, p. 52
30. A Raw Youth, p. 370
31. Letters to his Family and Friends, p. 6-7
32. Pages from the Journal of An Author, p. 71-2
33. Avrahm Yarmolinsky, Dostoevsky: A Life (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 1934), p. 395
34. Pages from the Journal of An Author, p. 19
35. Edward Hallett Carr, Dostoevsky (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931), p. 281-2
36. The Idiot, p. 530
37. Ibid., p. 530-1
38. The Brothers Karamazov, p. 308
39. The House of the Dead, p. 228-9
40. Pages from the Journal of An Author, p. 67
41. Ibid., p. 67-8
42. A Raw Youth, p. 467
43. See p. 13
44. Letters to His Family and Friends, p. 236
45. The Possessed, p. 629
46. The Possessed, p. 629
47. Pages from the Journal of An Author, p. 74
48. The Brothers Karamazov, p. 278

Won by Christ — One in Christ

-- A Scriptural Concept of Christian Unity --

by James M. Gall

WON BY CHRIST -- ONE IN CHRIST

--A Scriptural Concept of Christian Unity
by James M. Gall

Along a rocky garden pathway a lone figure was once prostrated on the ground in a blood-sweat with a breaking heart. The most earnest prayer ever to pierce heaven ascended from His lips. He was the one Lord praying to the one God -- His Father -- for the unity of His one body in the one faith expressed through the one spirit by the one baptism to the one hope of calling.

The eternal intention of God, the passionate prayer of Jesus, the continuing influence of the Holy Spirit, and the earnest ideal of the apostles and all the saints of the ages has been for the unity of all believers. The success of God's great plan for the redemption of man depends upon the ability of the church to demonstrate the possibility of complete unity of all men in Christ. The church is the "household of God"[1] --Christ's fold--into which He longs to see brought all men that "they shall become one flock."[2] In agonizing prayer Christ hopefully plead "that they may all be one . . . that the world may believe that thou didst send me."[3] The Holy Spirit is the Guide through whom we have "our access in one spirit unto the Father"[4] -- the same Personality of whom it is said, "For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body."[5] The divinely inspired apostles saturated their teaching with the doctrine of unity.[6] The largest cooperative endeavors in modern Christendom have been purposed to seek means by which some sort of unity might be attained. What concept, then, of Christian unity can we develop from the pages of God's Word?

That all believers in Christ should be united so as to constitute but one body, one communion, one church, is a proposition clearly set forth in the New Testament scriptures. No one in this enlightened age doubts that the original church was one, but there are those who by various apologetics attempt to justify the

present day debacle of division and confusion. However, in spite of such attempts all pious men want unity because they know it to be the only means of doing the Father's will and accomplishing the mission of the church. The one thing the church is to do is to accomplish the evangelization and Christianization of the world, and this it cannot do in a divided state.[7]

Jesus' own declaration was that unity is essential in order that the world can believe. The only ideal and practical plan whereby unity may be brought about is that found in the New Testament. Human wisdom cannot spark an infallible plan. Let us picture from the words of Christ and His apostles the scriptural concept of Christian unity. Let us envision a people won by Christ--one in Christ.

This discussion of unity will be considered in three parts: (1) Unity Idealized, (2) Unity Visualized, and (3) Unity Realized.

I. UNITY IDEALIZED

The ideal of Christian unity originated in the mind of God and was expressed in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, His Son. Christ put it most adequately into words as He prayed the Lord's prayer in the garden in the hour of His greatest trial:

> Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one: even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovedst me.[8]

As Hayes points out:

> It is not without significance that Jesus asked only one thing for his church in this world: he prayed only for its unity. He did not pray for its preservation--he knew that unity on the basis of the truth would make it perpetual; he did not pray for its triumph--he knew that a united presentation of the truth would succeed; he did not pray for its unity, its popularity, or its power--he knew that unity in the truth would secure all these.[9]

The life of Christ presents three principles in the nature of the oneness of the Father and the Son. In the first place, the Father and the Son are ONE IN WORD. Jesus stated, "I speak not from myself; but the Father that sent me hath given me a commandment," as is recorded in John 12:49, and in John 8:55, "I keep his word."

Secondly, the Father and the Son are ONE IN WILL. When wills are merged into one, there is no difference in the teaching of the one Word. "I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," Jesus said in John 5:30. How many of us can give this single reason for our conduct? When identities are lost in Christ and wills are merged with God's, unity will be real.

In the third place, the Father and the Son are ONE IN WORK. In John 9:4 Christ said, "We must work the works of him that sent me," and in John 5:19, "What things soever He doeth, these the Son also does." The intention of the Son was complete cooperation with His Father in seeking and saving the lost.

In order for the church of today to reproduce this nature it is necessary to do the Lord's will, speak His words, and accomplish the same work He sought to accomplish. He declared to His apostles, "As the Father has sent me, even so send I you."[10] The commission to each of us today is to accomplish the same will, equipped with the same word, doing the same work. Just as Christ drew His life and power from God, and just as the branch draws its life from the vine,[11] so the Christian draws his life from Christ. It is a natural law that a branch cut off from its parent plant has lost its source of life.

> No truth is more prominent in the Bible than the unity of the saints. No point do the apostles more often and more strongly urge, and there is no duty more solemnly and frequently enforced than the perfect oneness of believers. And they place this union on high and sacred ground.[12]

This is unity idealized. The ideal is a majestic one, and the realization of it is a lofty aim, but the New Testament clearly visualizes it.

II. UNITY VISUALIZED

The authoritative Word of the authoritative Lord is the only basis on which we can visualize true unity. Jesus said, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."[13] He said of the declaration of faith in His divine person and in His divine mission, ". . . upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."[14] Paul said, "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."[15] Jesus Christ is the rock on which the church

s built. Every church founded on any other asis or built on any other foundation will urely perish. "Every plant which my heavenly ather hath not planted shall be rooted up."[16]

Certainly Christ is a sufficiently strong foun-ation and a broad enough basis on which all ne believing world could be and must be united.

The most comprehensive statement of the asis on which Christian unity may be achieved s that spoken by Paul to the Ephesians. The even items in the concept are set forth in erses four through six in the fourth chapter of at letter:

> There is one body, and one spirit, even s also ye were called in one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one aptism, one God and Father of all, who over all, and through all, and in all.

There is one BODY. This excludes all chances r compromise and outlaws all divisions. Paul ld the Corinthians, "For as the body is one, d hath many members, and all the members of e body, being many, are one body; so also is hrist." He reiterated the same idea to the omans;

> For even as we have many members in ne body, and all the members have not e same office: so we, who are many, re one body in Christ, and severally embers one of another. [18]

here is certainly no room for sects, schisms, d denominations in one body. Christ is the ead of this divine organism. Most religionists ccept the logic of the one head for the body, t many of the same persons seem satisfied supply several bodies for the one head. A mber of times the New Testament describes e church as the body of Christ, and until the hurch universal becomes one body under the ne Head, its entrusted mission will not be lfilled. Other references characterize the hurch as the bride of Christ. Certainly He as but one bride. As the faithful Bridegroom d the one Head, Jesus adds us to His one dy--the church.

The second essential is the one SPIRIT. "For n one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, hether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, nd were all made to drink of one Spirit."[19] The oly Spirit gives life to the one body. He ourishes us in the Christian life by helping us roperly digest the truth which is supplied in ne Word of God. When Christians seek the gui-ance of the Spirit in their efforts toward unity, ney should be careful to follow His leading hrough the Word.

There is one HOPE. It is the consoling hope esulting from sins' forgiveness. It is also ne hope of perfection we shall enjoy in our reator's presence. Paul told Titus that it is "the hope of eternal life,"[20] and "a blessed hope."[21] It is "a better hope,"[22] "a living hope,"[23] "the hope which is laid up for you in the heavens."[24] This hope in Christ for the future is not voiced by confusion; it is the product of the one Spirit and the possession of the one body.

Ideal unity embraces one LORD. The Lordship of King Jesus is a basic theme in precept and example across the pages of the New Testament. Three principles precede it and three follow it in Paul's platform in Ephesians, significantly symbolizing its central position in the nucleus of Christian unity. Christ is King of Kings and Lord of Lords over all things. He is the blessed and only Potentate, our Head. We must pledge our allegiance to His supreme authority. John the Baptist was called the greatest man born of woman up to that time by Christ Himself, and yet he counted himself unworthy even to untie the Master's shoes. Paul was such an impressive, God-like man that the people in Lystra thought a god had come to visit, but he never questioned the authority of the Lord. The great Peter was impetuous, but he was not insubordinate. If the religious leaders of the ages since had been so inclined to bow at the feet of King Jesus, perhaps the chaotic condition of Christendom would have been avoided and the blinding fog that has engulfed the body of Christ might not have settled upon the earth.

The fifth requirement is one FAITH. It is quite apparent that a variety of beliefs will produce a variety of divisions, whereas singleness of belief produces oneness. Christ inspires but one faith in everyone whose full allegiance is in Him. The basic aspects of this faith are two-fold. Objective faith encompasses the entire truth presented in the scriptures. It is a credence in all the inspired scriptures, and in all that they teach. Jesus is its Author and Perfecter.[25] Jude was speaking of it when he said, "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."[26] This is the fact of faith; the testimony to be believed. Subjective faith is the individual response to that testimony. It is the belief "of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul."[27] Only through this one faith can men be lifted from the domination of sin to the realm of children of God. John said of Jesus' ministry, in explaining the reason for the written gospel:

> Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name. [28]

This is the one faith. It calls for complete surrender to the Lordship of the one Lord.

The next means to unity is the one BAPTISM which is the open expression of the one faith in the one Lord. Baptism is void without faith, and faith is incomplete minus baptism.[29] Surely the writer visualized one baptism as a single, definite, uniform action.

> Without previous faith in the blood of Christ, and deep and unfeigned repentance before God, neither immersion in water, nor any other action, can secure to us the blessings of peace and pardon. It can merit nothing. Still to the believing penitent it is the MEANS of receiving a formal, distinct, and specific absolution, or release from guilt. Therefore, none but those who have first believed the testimony of God and have repented of their sins, and that have been intelligently immersed into his death, have the full and explicit testimony of God, assuring them of pardon. [30]

> For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. [31]

The last principle in this platform of Christian unity is the Fatherhood of the one GOD. Through His only begotten Son He gave us power to become His sons.[32] Redemption is His gift. He is the Perfect Author of the perfect plan. God is the Creator and Father of all--over them, through them, and in them.

The principles are all simple, although they are completely essential. Close scrutiny discloses that they compose a matter of Christian loyalty. This is the ideal visualized.

III. UNITY REALIZED

A plan, an ideal, or any proposal is evaluated by its practicability. The scriptural concept for Christian unity which has been cited will work. The church of the first century realized its practicality. The entire world felt the impact of the unified church during the lifetime of its first leaders. Every description of it is the idea of a unit as conveyed in the epistles.

The original church "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers."[33] We are told that "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul."[34] Their consecrated Christian conduct seems to have been the secret of their power. It can be our power.

Kershner observes:

> This early Jerusalem congregation was no doubt a typical church of Christ. In its simplicity of organization, its practical outlook upon life, its grasp of the problem of social service, and its spiritual emphasis, it presents appealing characteristics which have never since been adequately recognized. When Christianity gets back to the ideal of that first Jerusalem congregation, it will shake the world a second time. [35]

The early church was loyal to Christ. They were free in Christ. Whenever and wherever an individual has misplaced his loyalty, he has hampered or lost his freedom, and has divided himself from the unified body. Loyalty to human organization and institutionalism has resulted in a regimented and enslaved church.

William Robinson says of Paul's view of loyalty and freedom:

> He saw in a religion which BASED ITSELF ON PERSONALITY--for such was Christianity--the possibility of a Church which transcended both--at once the home of freedom and of loyalty. For the soul needs both freedom and loyalty for its highest development. In fact, freedom is loyalty, and loyalty is freedom. He is most free who is most loyal, providing he chooses a loyalty which is big enough for freedom to develop in, and so further deepen his loyalty. In other words, loyalty is the only atmosphere in which freedom can work. [36]

Absolute loyalty to Christ and His Word are essential to Christian unity.

Farther along in the fourth chapter of Ephesians we are told of Christ:

> And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. [37]

Unity was a reality once; it can be realized again.

> David of old sang, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" [38]

The New Testament concept was unity, not federation. Jesus' prayer for the unity of believers is a striking contrast to the modern plans for union of denominations. The scrip-

tural basis for Christian unity is the only true and sure way to the fulfillment of the Lord's prayer. It is a glorious concept. And the church will be a glorious church when she realizes the blessed day of that unity in her Lord. Then we shall all simply and truly be:

WON BY CHRIST--ONE IN CHRIST

FOOTNOTES

1. Eph. 2:19
2. John 10:16
3. John 17:21
4. Eph. 2:18
5. I Cor. 12:13
6. Cf. Rom. 12:16, 15:5, 16:17; I Cor. 1:10, 12:25; 2 Cor. 13:11; Gal. 5:15; Eph. 4:1-3, 13, 14; Phil. 2:2, 3; Col. 1:23, 2:2; 2 Thess. 2:15; I Tim. 6:3-5; Tit. 1:10, 11; Heb. 13:1, 12:14; Jas. 3:14-16; I Pet. 1:1, 22, 3:8; 2 John 9-11; Jude 4, 16.
7. Howard Hayes, "The New Testament Ideal and Practice of Christian Unity," Shane Quarterly, July 1943, p. 163.
8. John 17:20-23
9. Hayes, op. cit., p. 164
10. John 20:21
11. John 15:4,5
12. Thomas W. Phillips, The Church of Christ (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1943), p. 308.
13. Matt. 28:18
14. Matt. 16:18
15. I Cor. 3:11
16. Matt. 15:13
17. I Cor. 12:12
18. Rom. 12:4,5
19. I Cor. 12:13
20. Tit. 1:2, 3:7
21. Tit. 2:13
22. Heb. 7:19
23. I Pet. 1:3
24. Col. 1:5
25. Heb. 12:2
26. Jude 3
27. Heb. 10:39b
28. John 20:30, 31
29. Hayes, op. cit., p. 170
30. Alexander Campbell, The Christian System (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company), p. 42
31. Gal. 3:27, 28.
32. John 1:12
33. Acts 2:42
34. Acts 4:32a
35. Frederick D. Kershner, How to Promote Christian Union (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1935), p. 7,8.
36. Dean E. Walker, Adventuring for Christian Unity (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1935), p. 7, 8.
37. Eph. 4:1 1-13.
38. Ps. 133:1

Date of Daniel

by Don DeWelt

THE DATE OF DANIEL

"Of what practical purpose is there in a consideration of this subject?" This would be a rather natural response of the average reader to the first observance of the title of this paper. But there is more involved in our subject than the establishment of one date or another for the book of Daniel. There is indeed the whole of a system of thought involved. Perhaps we could say that there is fastened to the investigation of this subject a philosophy of life, and that is no small matter.

E. B. Pusey, an outstanding scholar, well states the importance of our consideration: "The book of Daniel, is especially fitted to be a battleground between faith and unbelief. It admits of no halfway measures. It is either Divine or an imposture."[1] If we can not accept this book for what it plainly purports to be how can we accept any book in the Bible? The lines of battle are well drawn up by Edward J. Young in his book:

The book of Daniel purports to be a serious history. It claims to be a revelation from the God of heaven which concerns the future welfare of men and nations. If this book were issued at the time of the Maccabees for the purpose of strengthening the faith of the people of that time, and the impression was thereby created that Daniel a Jew of the 6th century were the author, then, whether we like it or no -- the book is a fraud.[2]

But just what are the claims as to the book being "issued at the time of the Maccabees," (about 165 B. C.)? Here is a clear statement from Julius A. Bewer, a recognized Liberal scholar in this field:

In the little country town of Modin lived Matthathias a priest, with his five sons, chief among them the lion-hearted Judus Maccabeus. They led a revolt, and in the next few years they won incredible vic-

tories. In 165, Jerusalem, except only the citadel, was in their hands, and on the 25th of Kislev (December) 165, the temple was cleansed and rededicated. But after all, how could the small host withstand in the long run the power of a world empire like Syria? It seemed impossible, and in many hearts hope died and the look of despair came into many eyes. Just at this crisis there appeared the Book of Daniel throbbing with the power of unconquerable faith. Like a trumpet it sounded the call to loyalty and trust. Hold fast! Be faithful to your God! The time of salvation is at hand. Soon, very soon complete and glorious victory will be yours. [3]

Another voice is heard, this time that of a writer who speaks for what he calls the "New Scholarship:"

On grounds of internal evidence the Book of Daniel was ascribed to the time of Antiochus IV, (B. C. 173-164), even before archaeological discoveries in Babylonia and Persia had placed in our hand contemporary records of the kings of Babylon and Persia mentioned in that book... It is now generally admitted that the Book of Daniel was composed somewhere in the period B.C. 168-164." [4]

It is the purpose of this paper to examine the evidence for the date of Daniel. If in the examination of the "evidences" of those who contend for a later date for the book we find such evidences wanting in support then the claims that have just been made for the date of B.C. 168-164 will have been proven to have rested upon pure assumption.

I. The book of Daniel does not appear among the Prophets in the Hebrew canon but rather in the Writings or Hagiographa, and that towards the very end of these writings. [5]

It might be well to say that the Hebrew canon was divided into three groups: The Law, which included the five books of the Pentateuch, The Prophets, which included Joshua through Malachi, and The Writings, which included: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, DANIEL, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles. The inference of the point presented is that had the book of Daniel been accepted as prophecy it would have been placed by the Hebrews among the other prophetic books. Added to this is the thought that the Hebrew canon of The Prophets was closed not later than B. C. 300-200, therefore the book of Daniel must have been written after this date. We will begin our answer by saying that the reason for the book's appearance in The Writings and not among The Prophets is due to the position of the man Daniel in the mind of the Hebrew. He was not a prophet by the careful Hebrew definition. (Deut. 18:18), but he had the prophetic gift. He was trained to be a statesman, not a preacher or reformer, (as all critics will admit). Hence his writings should not stand among The Prophets but where they belong among the inspired Writings. The date B. C. 300-200 for the close of the canon of The Prophets is purely arbitrary.

This erroneous pre-supposition loses sight of the essential character of Biblical inspiration. Inspired Scripture possesses INTRINSIC binding authority and did not have to wait for either a long or short period of time to give it this quality, nor is this quality dependent on the popularity of the prophet, nor on the reception or rejection of his message. [6]

In the critical argument there is thus involved the unsound and arbitrary assumption that the incorporation of recent or almost contemporary work in the same collection with the older prophets would not have been approved. Both points of this position are subjective in origin.

II. While Jesus Ben-Sirach, who wrote somewhere between B.C. 290 and 190, mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Prophets, he does not refer to Daniel. [7]

Jesus Ben-Sirach wrote a book called Ecclesiasticus. The point of the above argument is based on silence, not on what Ben-Sirach did say but rather on what he did not say. Are we to understand that because he does not mention Asa, Jehoshaphat or Ezra that they did not exist? It might be of import to note as we read the list of the books Ben-Sirach does mention that they are all books classed by the Hebrews among The Prophets. Therefore we could conclude that he does not mention the book of Daniel for the same reason that he does not mention the book of Psalms, Proverbs, or Job, or any of the other books among The Writings. It is plain that Jesus Ben Sirach was only speaking of the books of The Prophets.

III. The evidence of language shows that the book must have been written after the commencement of the Greek period: [8]

A. The use of the name "Chaldean" to signify not a people or a nation

but a caste of wise men.

The objection here is that this sense of the word does not appear elsewhere in the scriptures nor upon the monuments of the land, but in 440 B. C. Herodotus used this term in the same sense of the word "Chaldean" as that used by Daniel. Herodotus not only uses the restricted sense of the word but suggests that this group of priests called "Chaldeans" had held this position since the time of Cyrus.[9] Thus it appears reasonable to conclude that the Chaldeans who had opposed Xerxes were of the same order that Herodotus met.

B. The use of the three Greek words, which are the names of musical instruments "demand a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (B. C. 332)" [10]

Psalms 137:3 states: "For they that led us captive required of us songs, and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion." If the Jewish captives were required to furnish music would it be incredible to conclude that the Greek captives from Cyprus, Ionia, Lydia and Cilicia were called upon to do the same? The language of music is universal and it would not take many years before it would pass from one nation to another. As a specific instance mention could be made of the seven-stringed harp invented by the Greek poet Terpander. The Assyrian king Assurbanipal died twenty-five years after the harp was invented yet it is seen upon his monuments and one was buried with him.[11]

C. The Persian term "satrap" is out of place as a Babylonian title.

This is not difficult to understand when we realize the tremendous influence of the Persian nation in the court of Nebuchadnezzar. Other Persian influences have been observed by archeologists.[12] But inasmuch as Daniel wrote after the fall of Babylon he might well have employed Persian terms as substitutes for the older Babylonian terms. His writings were to be read by persons under Persian influence.

IV. There are certain historical inaccuracies and peculiarities, such as:

A. The thought expressed in Daniel 1:1 "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it."

It is urged that this is an anachronism because Jeremiah 25:1 shows that the fourth year of Jehoiakim was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar. Several explanations are offered for this problem. The one that seems to best solve it is that Daniel was counting time as the Babylonians would count it and Jeremiah according to those of Palestine. In Babylon the first year of Nebuchadrezzar would not be called the first year but "the year of the accession to the kingdom." Following this the years would begin their enumeration as one, two, three, etc. Thus the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim by Palestinian time (as Jeremiah would count it) would be the fourth year by Babylonian time (as Daniel would count it).[13] This point of argument can be turned to an advantage for the genuineness of the book and its early date. Note in Daniel 9:2 that Daniel was acquainted with the book of Jeremiah. If the book of Daniel was composed by some unknown Jew why not make it look as authentic as possible and copy Jeremiah's date as he has it?

B. The statement that Belshazzar was the last king of Babylonia and Nebuchadrezzar his father, whereas we know from the records that Nabonidus, and a man in no wise related to Nebuchadrezzar, was the last king of Babylonia.[14]

Archeology has completely set aside this objection. Note this passage taken from a Babylonian record:

> He intrusted a camp to his eldest, first-born son; the troops of the land he sent with him. He freed his hand, he entrusted the kingship to him.[15]

The name Belshazzar or Belsharusur is mentioned earlier on the same record as being the first-born son. The fact that Nebuchadrezzar is called his father offers little trouble in light of the fact that the term for father has many connotations in this language. It is used here in the sense of being his ancestor or predecessor. "In similar fashion, Jehu, the usurper, is called the 'son of Omri' by the Assyrians as recorded on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III, although without any blood relation at all..."[16] Let us not forget that Daniel was acquainted with the writings of Jeremiah where it is plainly stated that Evilmerodach is said to be the immediate successor to Nebuchadrezzar.[17]

C. The statement that Darius the Mede, son of Ahasuerus, became, after the death of Belshazzar, "king over the realm of the Chaldeans," whereas we know from the records that Cyrus succeeded Nabonidus, and was in turn succeeded by Cam-

byses, etc.[18]

Let it be honestly admitted that no such person as Darius the Mede has been mentioned non-biblically, but is that a reason for saying he never existed? In cases of the discoveries concerning Sargon (Isa. 20:1) and Belshazzar there should be cause for caution in using an argument from silence. Driver wisely observes: "and a cautious criticism will not build too much on the silence of inscriptions, where many certainly remain yet to be brought to light."[19]

D. In Daniel 9:2 it is stated that Daniel "understood by the books" the time of the exile. This reference to a collection of sacred books to the critic immediately suggests a Hebrew canon, such a canon could never have existed in the exile period therefore the book of Daniel must be given to a later date.

This is an unwarranted assumption. Are we to conclude each time we read of a collection of books or sacred writings that it must necessarily refer to a canon? This conclusion does not follow. What is probably meant, although we can not know for certainty, is a collection of sacred writings among which was the book of Jeremiah from which Daniel understood the date of the exile.

E. Daniel mentions after the downfall of Babylon an empire of Media. This being true the four kingdoms of Daniel 2 would be: 1. Babylonia, 2. Media-Persia, 3. Persia, 4. Greece. Instead of the manner in which they are usually counted i.e.: 1. Babylonia, 2. Media-Persia, 3. Greece, 4. Roman.

A very careful consideration of what Daniel does say and what he does not say will help here. Daniel does say that a Median king ruled after Belshazzar (Dan. 5:30). Does the fact that he was of Median ancestry presuppose the fact that there was also a Median kingdom under his rule? The words of Wilson are sharply to the point when he says:

> The statement that Darius was a Mede no more proves that he was king of Media than does the statement that Napoleon was a Corsican prove that he was king of Corsica. Besides he may have been a king of Media and still have been subordinate to Cyrus king of Persia. Murat was a Frenchman who was made king of Naples and was subordinate to a Corsican Italian who became emperor of the French.[20]

V. The theology of the book is pointed out as dealing with angels, the Messiah, the resurrection, judgment etc. which were not developed until after the exile.

We are called upon here to receive an apriorism as a fact. Because a pre-supposition will not allow the development of these subjects until after the exile are we then to immediately place all references in the Old Testament to such subjects in a period after the exile? The doctrine of the Messiah is found throughout the Old Testament beginning with Gen. 3:15. The doctrine of the resurrection is likewise mentioned in the Old Testament: Cf. Isa. 26:19; Ezek. 37; Job 19:25. The subject of the judgment is also discussed: Isa. 42:1-4: Joel 3:9-17; Psa. 1:5; 9:7. The most radical of critics would not locate all these books after the exile.

VI. The rejection of the supernatural has caused many to reject the earlier date of the book.

This is true because of the very accurate description of the wars between Syria and Egypt at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes that is given in the eleven chapter of the book of Daniel. The critic says that such a description could never be found in a book before the event happened. We are answering the objections one by one and showing that the book COULD have been written in the 6th century. If our position is correct then the description of Antiochus Epiphanes is the strongest argument for the inspiration of the book inasmuch as it was written hundreds of years before it happened. Chapter eight likewise pictures these times with amazing accuracy. The stories in the book of Daniel that tell of the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, the madness of Nebuchadrezzar, Daniel in the Den of lions are dismissed as myths. As an example of such dismissal note the words of Pfeiffer:

> This traditional theory, by accepting the book at its face value, necessarily presupposes the reality of the supernatural and divine origin of the revelations it contains.[21]

This argument leads us to the very foundation upon which the structure of modern criticism rests. The basic objection of the modernist is that the fundamentalist arrives at his conclusions by "a priori" reasoning, or an argument declared from conclusions previously formed. We are accused of approaching the Bible with our minds made up that it is "God breathed" and therefore cannot contain error.

apparent error appears we do not call the scriptures into question but our own reasoning. Let us admit to the charge. This is true. But WHY do we approach the Scriptures with this pre-supposition? It is because we have inductively considered the data available on matters of dispute and feel the reasons for holding our position are far more conclusive than those presented against it. Hear T. Engelder on this point:

> Just by the way, why should the moderns indulge in such violent harangues against the wrong of a priori reasoning, denouncing our attitude as due to prejudice and bias, when they are indeed guilty of this very thing? The liberals are unable to approach the Bible with an open mind. They approach it WITH THE PRECONCEIVED OPINION that it is a human book, subject to errors. They meet its claim that it is God's book WITH SUSPICION. They set up the PREMISE that they know as much about these things as Scripture. They oppose to the PREMISE of faith the PREMISE of unbelief. They oppose the IPSE DIXIT of Scripture with the IPSE DIXIT of their own reason. H. M'Intosh said of them:..."who denounce every independent man that, after the example and on the authority of Christ and of His inspired apostles, would dare to uphold the Bible claim or to differ from the false but oracular ASSERTIONS or to refuse to accept the INFALLIBLE IPSE DIXIT of those presumptious speculators who are vain enough to claim for their crude, ephemeral productions what they deny to the oracles of God and to the very words of even the Son of God. [22]

The terminology of this quotation is a bit strong, and in itself somewhat presumptuous but the principle is well stated and carries.

Over against the modernist view we have the thought that Daniel was the writer of the book, and that it was written in the 6th century B.C. There are some very substantial reasons for holding this viewpoint. They can be summarized as follows:

I. In the second part of the book Daniel is said to have received the revelation, moreover, speaks in the first person. (Cf. 7:2, 4, 6; 8:1; 9:2; 10:2; 12:5-8) Daniel is commanded to keep the book in which the words are found.

II. The book is very plainly the work of one writer. (This is admitted by most critics) Daniel is the one who is said to have received certain of the revelations, it would follow then that he could be the writer of the whole book.

III. The Lord explicitly speaks of Daniel the prophet, as having foretold the "abomination of desolation." (Matt. 24:15) In other passages our Lord refers to the prophecies of Daniel, and thus, at least indirectly approves their genuineness. (Cf. Matt. 10:23; 16:26; 19:28; 24:30; 25:31; 26:64.)

IV. The book reflects the background of the Babylonian and Persian empires. The historical objections are not at all sufficient to overthrow this fact.

V. It was accepted in early Hebrew tradition as canonical. A careful examination of the method of establishing the Old Testament canon will show the force of this argument.

VI. There is no real contrary evidence. This has been shown by an examination of such supposed evidence.

It is not the essential purpose of this paper to elaborate upon the traditional view of the date of Daniel, but rather to present fairly the view of the modernist and examine it. This I trust we have accomplished.

SUMMARY

The question of the date of Daniel is an important one because of what it presupposes. The reasons offered for claiming a late date of 165 B.C. are:

I. Its non-appearance among the books of the Prophets.
II. It is not mentioned by Jesus Ben-Sirach.
III. Evidence of language:
  A. The use of the name Chaldean.
  B. The use of the three Greek names.
  C. The Persian term "satrap."
IV. Certain historical inaccuracies:
  A. The third year of Jehoiakim.
  B. The use of the name "Belshazzar the king."
  C. The appearance of Darius the Mede as king.
  D. The Hebrew canon in Dan. 9:2.
  E. Daniel's mention of the empire of Media.
V. The theology of the book.

These five objections were considered and answered. In the consideration we trust that you found our reasoning conclusive.

We then presented what we believe was the foundation of the modernist attitude toward the Bible. Six reasons were given for accepting Daniel as the author of the book and the 6th century B.C. as the date for its writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Sir Robert. THE BIBLE AND

MODERN CRITICISM. London: Pickering and Inglis, 1931.

Abingdon Bible Commentary. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929

Barnes, Albert. NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. London: George Routledge Company, 1853.

Bewer, Julius A. THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Driver, S. R. INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1894.

Farrar, Fredrick. EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE, DANIEL. N.Y.: Hodder and Stoughton.

Finegan, Jack. LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT PAST. N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1946.

Engelder, Th. SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. Co., 1944.

Gordon, Cyrus H. INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT TIMES. Ventnor, N. J.: Ventnor Publishing, 1953.

Montogomery, James A. INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY. N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

Oesterley and Robinson. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. London: S.P.C.K. Co., 1953.

Peters, J. P. THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW SCHOLARSHIP. N. Y.: Macmillian, 1902.

Pfeiffer, R. H. INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. N. Y.: Harper Bros., 1948.

Rowley, H. H. THE GROWTH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Hutchinson's London University Library, 1950.

Thompson, J.E.H. PULPIT COMMENTARY, DANIEL. N.Y.: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1903.

Unger, M.F. INTRODUCTORY GUIDE TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's, 1948.

Wilson, R.D. STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL. Philadelphia: Sunday School Times, 1926.

Young, E. J. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's, 1950.

Young, E. J. THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's, 1953.

1. Pusey, E.B., Daniel The Prophet, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1891. p. 75.
2. Young, E.J. Daniel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948. p. 13
3. Bewer, Julius A., The Literature of the Old Testament. p. 411.
4. Peters, J.P., The Old Testament and New Scholarship, p. 293
5. Pfeiffer, R.H., Introduction to the Old Testament. p. 757. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the O. T. p. 467.
6. Unger, M.F., Introductory Guide to the Old Testament. p. 66
7. Oesterley and Robinson, An Introduction to the books of the Old Testament. p. 330
8. Rowley, H.H., The Growth of the Old Testament p. 157
9. Ibid.
10. Driver, op. Cit. p. 476
11. Rimmer, H., Dead Men Tell Tales, p. 324
12. Unger, M.F. Archeology and the Old Testament. p. 294
13. Young, op. cit. p. 356 and Pulpit Commentary. Vol. 13 p. li-lix
14. Peters, J.P., op. cit. p. 294
15. Finegan, Jack, Light From the Ancient Past. p. 189
16. Unger, M.F. op. cit. p. 398
17. Gordon, Cyrus H. Introduction to Old Testament Times. p. 286
18. Peters, J.P. op. cit. p. 295
19. Driver, S.R. op. cit. p. 469
20. Young, op. cit. p. 353
21. Pfeiffer, op. cit. p. 755
22. Engelder, Th., Scripture Cannot Be Broken. p.40